E 559
.H64
Copy 1

E
559
.H64

The Union Record of
Hon. Joshua Hill of Georgia.
Washington, 1870.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Class E 659

Book .H69

THE

UNION RECORD

OF

Hon. Joshua Hill

OF GEORGIA.

A LETTER IN REPLY TO HIS ENEMIES.

WASHINGTON, D. C.
GIBSON BROTHERS, PRINTERS.
1870.

LETTER

OF

Hon. JOSHUA HILL, of Georgia,

ON THE

ELECTION OF U. S. SENATORS.

superstitious." It so happened that I had been warned—and that, not in a dream, but with my eyes and ears open, at least one week before the first meeting of the legislature—that a shrewd and knowing politician predicted the election of Alexander H. Stephens and Herschel V. Johnson as Senators. I never forgot the prophecy, nor ceased entirely to look for its fulfilment. It at least broke my fall, and, I think, made James Johnson's descent easier. Speaking of prophets, gentlemen, hereafter commend me to this political diviner. You cannot make less of it than a curious coincidence.

Some, to whom this fortune-telling had been communicated, and who may be too appreciative of a jest, regarded the animated contest between Messrs. Gartrell and Peeples as the best joke of the session. It reminded old turfmen of a gallantly contested four-mile race, with broken heats; and the cheers of the crowd, as the fleet steeds came, neck-and-neck, thundering down the last quarter-stretch, were almost audible. But the gallant contestants were, in the end, reminded of that beautiful Scriptural aphorism, "the race is not to the swift." They both ran well, and each was nigh the goal, but it was never *intended* (at least so thought fatalists and predestinarians) that either should win.

You attack my pretensions to loyalty to the Government of the United States, and demand, with an air of triumph, "What is the plea of loyalty set up by Mr. Hill?" You then proceed to contrast my poor efforts to save the Union to the Herculean labors of Mr. Stephens to preserve it, and succeed in convincing yourselves that Mr. Stephens has the better record. I never doubted its suiting you better, nor questioned that Jefferson Davis' record pleases many of you better still. Mr. Davis is entitled to all the credit that attaches to unflinching devotion to a cause that he consented to embrace and defend. Had I loved the cause, I could but have honored his constancy and determination. I never regarded the cause and the South as synonymous. I could not look upon the rebellion with favor when I felt that it was absolute ruin to the South and a curse upon my whole country.

It is surely no fault of mine that gentlemen should refuse to read my reported speeches and published letters. Had they done so they would now remember the uniformity of sentiment pervading them, and their ardent nationality. This is characteristic of all I said or wrote during my public service. But I am aware that I never had any particular

THE following letter is republished by me without the knowledge of Mr. Hill. He has had nothing to do, directly or indirectly, with its republication. I was taught to love the Union men of the South who suffered so much for the cause so dear to those of us who fought in the Union army.

I earnestly request all Republican Senators to read it carefully, that they may know something of the true Unionism of Mr. Hill. The letter was written by him in 1866 in answer to a letter written and published by his enemies.

J. E. BRYANT,
Late Brevet Lt. Col. 8th Maine Infantry.

NATIONAL HOTEL,
WASHINGTON, D. C., *March* 10, 1870.

REPLY OF HON. JOSHUA HILL

To the Sixty-nine Special Legislative Friends of Hon. A. H. Stephens.

GENTLEMEN—I have read your review of me and my recent speech on the Senatorial election. I have never had a newspaper controversy, nor have I the slightest desire for one. In your case, I would naturally seek to avoid "the war of the many with one," if for no other reason than the great disparity of numbers.

You have entered into an elaborate argument to prove that I was wrong in saying of Mr. Stephens that, under the circumstances, he could not escape a suspicion of having encouraged his election to the Senate. You say, after presenting your array of facts, that "Mr. Hill must fall back upon his judgment as being biased by his attitude." I admit I am not infallible. I may be obtuse. Whatever may be the general effect of your reasoning and facts, I cannot help thinking that some, more incredulous than the rest, will attribute to Mr. Stephens the amiable weakness of being too easily "over-persuaded." He did not refuse the high office as often as Cæsar did the "kingly crown," and yet Cæsar was slain for his ambition. But there was but *one* Anthony importuning Cæsar.

Unlike the men of Athens, I am not, "in all things, too

to my character and feelings, I am greatly indebted for marked courtesy and kindness.

Every man in Georgia, of ordinary intelligence, knows that I have been looked upon with distrust and unkindness, and am yet, for my attachment to the Union. How many of you have denounced me for my national principles? Which of you have censured Mr. Stephens for his abandonment of his opposition to secession, and for consenting to serve in the Provisional Congress at Montgomery, or for accepting the office of Vice-President of the Confederate States? Which of you blamed him for giving his counsel and personal influence to the rebel cause? When was it that you complained of him for encouraging the people to further exertion to obtain a separate nationality and independence? Let us be candid with each other, gentlemen. Do you not love and admire him more for his identification with the cause of disunion, and his consequent sufferings and imprisonment, than for his "early disrelish" of secession? I had come near saying, of the *doctrine* of secession. I am not aware that either of your Senators-elect has, at any time, denied the right of a State to secede, though both have condemned the exercise of the right for insufficient cause. I would not knowingly do either of them injustice. But what if they still hold that a State may of right secede? Do you condemn them for maintaining the opinion?

I have never sought to depreciate the effort of Mr. Stephens before the legislature in 1860, to prevent secession. It was meritorious. But I did complain at the time, and have continued to complain, that he did not refuse to sign the ordinance of secession, then move to refer it to the people, and, upon the refusal of the majority, to submit it to the popular vote, then call upon the friends of the people to withdraw with him from the convention. Years ago I expressed to Hon. B. H. Hill my regrets that he himself did not take that course.

It is not pleasant to advert to it, even at this distance of time; but the truth of history demands it. What public man, of all Georgia, besides myself, was publicly burned in effigy in more places than one in his own State, soon after the fatal act of secession was adopted? Think you it was because I favored disunion? Was that then regarded a crime? What secessionist was treated in like manner? Was Mr. Stephens the object of such contempt? To which of you am I under obligations for denouncing such unjustifi-

claims upon the public regard, further than being esteemed somewhat above that *contemptible thing,* a professional politician, in independence and candor. I never sought to win notoriety in any manner. Unlike some of whom I wot, I was not ashamed of the position of a private gentleman, living secluded from the world, and but little known beyond the small circle of friends surrounding me. And if a single one of you imagine that my election to the Senate would, in my own opinion, "add a cubit to my stature," or for an hour increase my vanity, you know little of me.

No; I have weighed "the glittering bauble," Fame, and for long years have been accustomed to say of it, that anything less than the reputation of Clay or Webster is not worth seeking.

Such reflections as these, aided, perhaps, by the severe teachings of misfortune, have enabled me to bear up under the frowns of former friends, and—

"To suffer
The stings and arrows of outrageous fortune,"

without repining.

For me to undertake to convince you that I loathed and abhorred disunion or secession, and that I never failed to rebuke it when I came to speak or write of it, would be to make myself ridiculous; and to acknowledge that your estimate of the value of my opinions is the universal one. As highly as I respect you, I cannot consent to abide your judgment of my insignificance.

As for my recognized devotion to the Union, it was a fact fixed in the minds of such men as John J. Crittenden, Stephen A. Douglas, James Pearce, and Henry Winter Davis, all of whom, "had they but served their God with half the zeal" they served their country, would now be, as I hope they are, bright angels in a better world. And of the living, let me name John Sherman of Ohio, Gen. John A. Logan, Charles F. Adams, Dawes, Thayer, Mr. Seward, and Morrill, and, I might add, all who knew me or observed my political course.

In the midst of the bloodiest scenes of the wicked and causeless war through which we have passed, it was a source of heartfelt comfort and consolation, "when my household gods lay shivered around me," to know that I was still cherished as the friend of the Union by my old associates throughout the nation. And to that settled conviction, as

able and vindictive displays of feeling towards me? I pray you make me sensible of my indebtedness, that I may thank you. Was it for my inertness in the defence of the Union, that I was thus contemned and despised by infuriated mobs? No; the friends of true liberty and order are never demonstrative; they are quiet and thoughtful. And to that one great, natural truth is this country indebted for the blighting curse of secession. It was not numbers, but the concentration of passion and prejudice, and the rabid spirit of intolerance, that effected disunion.

Had the honest, laboring masses, even of South Carolina, been appealed to as rational beings, and told by their public men that the State desired a calm expression of the popular will as to the propriety of disunion, and that he who voted for the Union was to be regarded as the equal in courage, devotion to the State, and every element of manliness of him who favored disunion, I feel confident the unwise step would never have been taken.

Pardon me if I show some anxiety to refute the prevailing idea of your letter, to wit: that I, at best, was a mere passive friend of the Union, of doubtful character, while Mr. Stephens was enthusiastic and devoted. I did not begin to make Union speeches in 1860. I began five years before that, in denunciation of that unfortunate measure, known as the Kansas bill—the greatest blunder, except, perhaps, the defeat of the Clayton compromise, ever made in American politics. I made no other but Union speeches from that time to this day.

I made many very thorough speeches in 1859 and 1860; several in the autumn of 1860, in Georgia, all of which appealed to the people to submit quietly and peaceably, as good citizens, to the probable election of Mr. Lincoln. I answered Mr. Wm. L. Yancey, who was regarded pretty generally as a respectable advocate of disunion. We both spoke in the State House of Maryland about the last of September, 1860. The next evening I spoke to many thousands in Baltimore, from the same stand with Governor Swann, Senator Kennedy and Representative Webster. The press said it was a Union speech, and complimented it very highly. Two days afterwards I addressed a large meeting in Washington city, as many can testify. But, of course, you never heard anything of all this, and refused to listen to anything I said. I received some substantial testimonials of regard from a Boston gentleman, for my reply to Mr. Yancey. You may

not know it, but I can assure you that the great orator of Alabama was quite as earnest in his declamation as was Mr. Toombs, and altogether as powerful. I never claimed any more credit for "measuring arms with the great orator on that occasion" than I have for discussing with Mr. Toombs or Mr. Stephens. I never heard any one compliment Hon. B. H. Hill on his exhibition of nerve for raising his voice in favor of the then despised Union. I believe no one was killed or hurt for doing it. On the contrary, I have heard that such was the courtesy of the excited period that Mr. Toombs himself, at the close of Mr. Stephens' speech, called for three cheers for the gifted orator, which were freely given.

I wrote a letter in December, 1860, over my own name, published in the *Southern Recorder*, first urging the people to require pledges of their delegates, in writing, before electing them, to submit the action of the Convention to the popular vote, in which I was severe on secession. But it escaped your attention—like all my labors.

Some of you are aware that I am a member of the still existing State Convention. I committed a grave error in that body in consenting to abandon my announced intention to insist on a reconsideration of the vote adopting the ordinance *repealing* the ordinance of secession, for the purpose of declaring said ordinance "absolutely null and void." I gave, at the time, my reasons, abating nothing of my principles and opinions, but reluctantly yielding to the solicitations of friends of the Union, and being anxious to avoid discussion calculated to produce discord and bitterness.

Had I reflected properly on the sustaining effect of the word "repeal" upon the doctrine of secession—the right of a State to secede from the Union—and, as a consequence, the legality of all indebtedness incurred by such State for the prosecution of a war in defence of the right of secession, I could not have been induced to forego my purpose. I could not have obtained a majority for the support of my views. It was manifest that a majority were opposed to the repudiation of the war debt, and that it was only carried by some yielding to the requirements of the president, and a greater number remaining silent.

To yield the willing assent of the mind, unreservedly, to the absolute nullity of every act of every representative body, intended to sustain, in any manner, the rebellion, is to reject the whole doctrine of secession. Until this is done, there is

no repudiation of the abominable heresy. It is a question of the highest importance to the people of the entire Union, that a distinct and emphatic renunciation of the doctrine of secession by States that have resorted to it to destroy the Union should precede the return of such States to a position of equality in the Union with unoffending States. The folly of restoring a State to the Union, with the boasted right of secession unimpaired, and still maintained and defended by its prominent officers, by a majority of the delegates of a convention of the people, and by a majority of the legislature, can only be equalled by an amendment of the Federal Constitution, expressly admitting the right of a State, for any cause in its own judgment sufficient, to withdraw from the Union.

This doctrine of secession, despite the mischiefs and miseries it has produced is this day, I fear, more generally tolerated, if not entertained, by the people of Georgia than it was when it was reduced to practice. The mass of mankind have neither leisure nor patience to investigate any great principle of government. They are oftener influenced by arguments that appeal to their feelings and interests than to their abstract sense of right. Many favored secession just as some others opposed it, because they believed their action beneficial to themselves. The rebellion has proven a failure up to this time, but most of its devotees yet believe it was right, and that had it not been crushed by numbers, they would have realized all they were promised. On the other hand, thousands of earnest opponents of secession who have suffered deeply by loss of fortune, and were made wretched by the bloody casualties of war, have relaxed in their feelings, and are by no means pertinacious in maintaining their former opinions. Men of sagacity, fond of the adulation of their fellows, and ambitious of place, know well this state of public feeling, and either sympathize with it, or allow it to exist without attempting to correct it. To be sure, there are prominent individual exceptions to this rule, but not sufficient to effect a change. Many limit their political vision to the boundaries of the State—content to shape its internal polity—without special regard for its Federal relations.

It is refreshing, in this dearth of sober reasoning, to find some of the foremost intellects that contributed all their powers to aid disunion, now openly proclaiming their opposition to the madness that would assert the right of the

State to be represented in Congress by just such individuals as the people or their representatives might prefer, wholly regardless of their past history. These gentlemen perceive plainly that they themselves, though heretofore often honored by the people with the highest trusts, are, by reason of their identification with secession and war, no longer proper instruments to be chosen to restore cordial relations between the State and national authorities. Recognizing secession as a failure, and a principle to be forever rebuked, they now express a willingness to be considered as no longer available public men, and to retire from the political arena, yielding to such as may be more agreeable on account of their political action to the Federal Government, and consequently more useful to the State. This is the beginning of wisdom. Do you agree with me in my estimate of such conduct? What think you of such modesty and self-denial? These gentlemen found no difficulty in restraining their friends from wantonly voting for them.

What though you insist that all differences of opinion as to past political events should be consigned to oblivion, never to be revived? Can you compel Congress to adopt your suggestion? It is not your will, but theirs, that must govern. Are you quite certain that your practice agrees with your teachings?

It may interest some who will take the pains to read what I write, to learn a few political incidents known to myself and others, which I relate merely to increase the evidence of my good standing as a Union man, with eminent Unionists, at a time when there was some merit in being a Union man. True love of the Union is like genuine, heartfelt piety. It is serene, uniform, forbearing; exhibiting itself in every act, and, without effort, convincing all men of its deep sincerity. And, what is more, it is independent of the frowns or blandishment of men. Washington was its impersonation. How few were capable of appreciating his grand patriotism; his exalted love of country.

I first saw and heard read the celebrated Crittenden compromise resolutions in December, 1860. I was invited to a room in Brown's Hotel, Washington, and there met some half-dozen moderate, but prominent members of the Republican party, I being the only Southern man present. Our host, a distinguished statesman and accomplished lawyer of Indiana, then in attendance on the Supreme Court, produced the famous "peace offering" in his own elegant hand, and

submitted it to the gentlemen present for their consideration and criticism. This noble man still lives, pledged never to accept political office. Should this chance to meet his eye, he will not fail to recall the scene. I mention this to show the esteem in which I was held by these national men, and the interest I felt for the preservation of the Union.

I recall, with melancholy interest, my last interview with my Indiana friend. It was by my own fireside in Washington. Georgia has seceded, and I, against the advice of true and sagacious friends, was preparing to return to my home. Both of us were mourning the folly and madness that menaced the peace of the country. He drew a vivid picture of the inevitable conflict he saw approaching, and feelingly suggested that his son and mine might meet in deadly strife, strangers to each other, and one of them might fall by the other's hand. It may have been prophetic. Few can ever know what I have lost, and fewer still will care. Many think I was but too fortunate in preserving my own far-spent life. I appeal not to man for sympathy, and yet I have met it, when it fell upon my crushed heart as the gentle dew on withering flowers. It came not from the hearts of unfeeling politicians. Oh, secession; secession! "Thy bruise is incurable, and thy wound is grievous," and yet thou livest unrebuked in Georgia.

A talented Georgian writes me in regard to the election of Senators, as follows: "Taking this fact in connection with the tone of our press, and the utterances of our public speakers, it may well be said of us, as was said of the Bourbons, 'They have learned nothing, and forget nothing by revolution. One would think that the secessionists were the victorious party if one did not know the contrary."

One of the most talented men in America said, in a speech soon after the close of the war: "We have disposed of the doctrine of secession by the bayonet; that acute suggestion, that though the State has not the right to secede, yet that the citizens are bound to obey their State, and that war by the State is not treason in them." Do you not so regard the doctrine, gentlemen? If you do not, will you favor the public with your definition.

That child of genius—that accomplished scholar and orator, and almost unrivalled master of the English language, Henry Winter Davis, said, in substance, that he knew of but three devoted Union men in all the South, who bowed their heads to the storm in silence, allowing it to sweep over

them. He instanced the venerated name of Pettigru, and added "the honored names of Joshua Hill and John Minor Botts." Whatever else may be said of him, it will scarcely be objected to Mr. Davis that he was in the slightest degree tolerant of secession or disunion. Do you not remember how the disunion press of the State used to assail me for the complimentary vote I gave him for Speaker?

I trust I do no injustice to the memory of one of the wisest and best men I ever knew, in referring to one of his treasured letters to me, bearing date the 28th of January, 1862. My distinguished and learned friend, though twenty years my senior, was born and reared on a tract of land adjoining my birth-place, in Abbeville District, South Carolina. Our fathers settled on adjoining places about the year 1790. The two families are still represented on the old farms. I was fortunate enough to enjoy the great man's confidence and friendship. This was more than power or wealth could have purchased. I never knew a patriot so unselfish, or a great thinker and ripe scholar so unpretending. In his matchless simplicity, he writes from his home in Charlestown: "I received a very agreeable surprise by yours of the 22d. It was not surprising that you should think of me, for we have drunk of the same brook, and have run barefoot over the same hills, not to forget one another, but I could hardly think that there was a single man left in the whole South that agreed so much with my opinions. I am fain to join in the clown's soliloquy sometimes, and reproach myself for following conscience, seeing the fiend gives the better counsel. For both town and country, old and young, on this side of the river, glorify themselves for everything good and great as secessionists, and rail against Yankees as the meanest and wickedest of the human race, for disagreeing with them in the destruction of the Union. In this rebellion against the Union, women and parsons are conspicuous for their zeal and acclamations. The most ferocious feelings are not only avowed, but boasted of, and nothing isrespectable but desperation. Why, a member of the legislature declared exultingly in the house that he was thankful for the fire, as it would make it easier to burn the rest of the town if the Yankees were likely to become masters of it.

"These things savor of madness more than passion. If they are to be believed, they would rather that South Carolina share the fate of Sodom than that secession should suffer a defeat, or even a temporary reverse. The detestation ex-

pressed for our late countrymen finds a parallel only in the contempt which the Chinese feel for the English and French barbarians. I am satisfied that this madness must, in time, give way to depression and lassitude, but how long it will last, no one can tell."

"The Northern mind seems to be almost as deeply stirred as that of the South; and though the South as natural fighters are more than a match for equal numbers, the preponderance of the North will encourage them to keep up the contest a long time, and, in the end, they may learn to fight, in which, at present, they are sadly at fault. So were the Russians when the Swedes gave them their first lessons."

There is a good deal more of conjecture as to the probable future, much of which has become history. He concludes with these sadly prophetic words: "The future is doubly dark. The most probable issue for both sides is, that instead of the military being subordinate to the civil authority, the revolution will end in the military having it all their own way. My hopes are subdued, but so are my fears. I don't expect to live to see the end, and am glad of it." He had his wish, and James Louis Petigru, no great while afterward, slept with his fathers. Would he have held such converse, at such a time, with any but a trusted friend of the Union? His whole life was one of consistent devotion to the Government of his country.

I have great respect for candor, even when coupled with fanaticism; hence my high regard for my friends Milledge L. Bonham and James L. Pon, both ultra disunionists and ardent in the cause of rebellion; both scorning to hide away in bomb-proof positions, and not content to display their valor by clamoring for war, testified their sincerity by exposing themselves on "well stricken fields."

You charge that I became a candidate for Governor, and "tried to get an office, the obtaining of which must have made it impossible for him (me) to take the oath," &c. I was no more a candidate for Governor than was Mr. Stephens a candidate for Senator. I deny trying to be elected. I refused to review the administration of Governor Brown, and to condemn it, when assured that by so doing I could concentrate upon myself the opposition to him, and thereby keep down a third candidate. "Solitary and alone," on the floor of Congress, I had censured his unlawful seizure of the U. S. Arsenal at Augusta, and Fort Pulaski, near Savannah. The secession convention afterwards approved his action, and thereby rebuked me. With which of us did you sympathize?

In permitting my name to be voted for, I only hoped to form the nucleus of a Southern conservative party, opposed to secession and war, and favoring peace. I called four or five of my most trusted friends living in this town and vicinity, all of whom yet live, to bear me witness that, under no possible circumstances, would I ever take an oath to support the Constitution of the Confederate States, or the government or laws thereof. We examined the official oath of the Governor, and concluded that, to him, as the civil and military head of the State, the oath for civil officers *only* did not apply. And if it had, and I could have been elected, I would have spurned it. In doing so, I should have made more character than I could by filling the office. The gentlemen to whom I refer are men of high character, and "have done the State some service." I am proud to claim them as my friends, and they are proud of my principles and my course, which few so well understand.

The secession and war press denounced my letter and its author. How many of you defended the letter, and vindicated me? The lovers of peace, and the honest haters of disunion, voted for me, when not driven from the polls by secession bullies. Some of you are late in discovering my strong anti-reconstruction sentiments. How many of you denounced me as a Unionist-reconstructionist, and everything objectionable, politically? Which of you made speeches against me? Did Union men complain of me? No; they rejoiced at the opportunity of voting for a man in whom they trusted. Your course has made them only more devoted to me. They constantly testify their regard for me. They remember fondly that I labored to prevent disunion, and that I never "bowed the knee to Baal."

But be consoled, gentlemen; you have the majority with you. With but a few exceptions, secessionists and war-men sustain your action, and openly exult at the overthrow of James Johnson and myself.

I declined all invitations to visit the armies, or to speak at any point. I made no defence to the assaults upon me, charging me with love of the Union and opposition to the war. In my letter, I declared the utter impossibility of restoring the lost Union *as it was.* I do not see that it has been returned to us *unchanged.* It possessed many features calculated to endear it to the people everywhere, that have been sadly altered by war. I rejoice that it cannot be said of me, that I, in any manner, assisted in producing these in-

novations. How many of you admire my course in refusing to vote for any officer of the Confederate Government? Do you not think that it would have been more praiseworthy to have even sought place under it? How many, and which of you, made speeches and arguments to soldiers to deter them from voting for me?

In a gallant regiment, to which some of you belonged, and of which six or seven companies went from my old congressional district—one of them from my own county, composed of the sons of my neighbors and friends, and of my own son—I received *one* single vote. That was cast by an independent, high-souled private, who dared to do what he conceived to be his duty. Many of these brave soldiers had been accustomed to vote for me for Congress, even against the advice of Mr. Stephens and Mr. Toombs, but on this trying occasion they could not incur the odium. They liked me personally, as I believe some of you do, but thought I loved the Union "not wisely, but too well."

I lost the support of the only very influential paper that advocated, for a time, my election, by promptly refusing, when required, to say that I would not consent to live under the same Government with the people of the free States. The election went by, and though only second in the race, as in the recent one, I preserved the respect of my friends and of myself. Success is not the true test of merit.

> "The rank is but the guinea's stamp,
> The man's the gowd for a' that."

Lest the President should be imposed upon, some *patriotic* Georgians furnished him with a copy of my letter. He understands it—he understands us all. He knows what *suspended* loyalty means, and knows how to appreciate new-born devotion to the Union. He knows, as well as you do, that Mr. Davis voted in the Senate Committee for the Crittenden compromise, and, of course, that he was opposed to disunion. This, you contend, makes a good Union record. Do *you* doubt, gentlemen, that the President or the Senate would have approved the election of Mr. Davis to the Senate by the legislature of Mississippi? What objection could be urged against it? Does any occur to *you?* Has he not talents and a large experience to commend him? And was not he, too, one of the prophets?

It occurs to me to inquire of you, what apology you propose to make for the very inconsiderable vote you gave the

President's provisional Governor, James Johnson, for Senator? In your zeal for the Union, how could you forget his record? What had he done to shake your confidence in his loyalty? Was it his excess of kindness in recommending applicants for pardon to the President, that you intended to rebuke? His fine talents and personal worth were not unknown to you. Can it be that you intend to reprimand him for accepting the appointment of Governor?

You are all satisfied that I am powerless in Georgia, but you are not so well assured that *your* condemnation of me is destructive of my influence at Washington. It becomes necessary, now, to insure that. You may succeed in convincing those who control the Government that the organization of a stupendous rebellion to overthrow the Constitutional Government of your country, the sacrifice of hundreds of thousands of valuable lives lost in trying to maintain the supreme authority, together with the slaughtered thousands cruelly seduced or driven to take arms as insurgents, is a light affair. You may, by ingenious argumentation, prove that the men most to be trusted by the Government are those most prominently and conspicuously identified with the rebel government; the men whose names must live in history, more on account of the high places they occupied in the rebel government than for anything they ever did in the service of their lawful Government. But when you succeed in all this, then cover over with a thick veil the niches in your capitol that may contain the statutes of Washington, Jackson, Webster and Clay, and forbid your countrymen to look upon them again. Then will the revolution prove a triumph, and the Union become a phantom.

Respectfully,

JOSHUA HILL.

MADISON, GA., *February* 10, 1866.

TO THE PRESS.

Such of you as have published the letter of Mr. Stephens' friends will do an act of justice, and of politeness, also, by publishing the above.

J. H.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 013 703 409 8

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 013 703 409 8